arXiv:1212.6423v1 [astro-ph.CO] 27 Dec 2012

Determination of neutrino masses from future observations of CMB B-mode polarization and the growth of structure

Koichi Hirano*
Department of Elementary Education, Tsuru University, Tsuru 402-8555, Japan

(Dated: January 1, 2013)

We estimate constraints on neutrino masses from future cosmological observations. We focus on the ongoing CMB observations, including B-mode polarization produced by a CMB lensing (Planck), and the future observations of the baryon acoustic oscillations and the growth of structure with an allsky galaxy redshift survey (BigBOSS). By these combined observational data, we estimate errors of the bounds on the total neutrino mass to be $\Delta\sum m_\nu \sim 0.03$ eV. In case that the fiducial values of the total neutrino mass is taken to be $\sum m_\nu = 0.05$ eV, this means that the neutrino mass hierarchy must be normal.

The standard model of particle physics assumed that neutrinos are massless. However, the neutrino oscillation experiments have revealed that neutrinos have non-zero masses. Mass-squared differences of the neutrinos obtained from neutrino oscillation experiments are $|\Delta m^2_{21}| = 7.59^{+0.19}_{-0.21} \times 10^{-5}\mathrm{eV}^2$ [1] and $|\Delta m^2_{32}| = 2.43^{+0.13}_{-0.13} \times 10^{-3}\mathrm{eV}^2$ [2]. However, the absolute masses and their hierarchical structure (normal or inverted) have not been determined yet. These are critical information to build such new particle physics models.

Terrestrial experiments such as tritium beta decay [3] and neutrinoless double-beta decay [4] give upper bounds on the absolute neutrino masses. On the other hand, cosmological observations have the potential to provide a powerful means of constraining neutrino properties, a more stringent bound on the total neutrino mass $\sum m_\nu$ and the effective number of neutrino species N_ν.

The cosmic microwave background (CMB) anisotropies are generated mainly until epochs before the last scattering surface of the decoupling epoch, $z \sim 1089$. Hence, if neutrino species are massive enough as $\sum m_\nu \gtrsim 1.5$ eV, they became nonrelativistic before the recombination epoch [5]. In this case, the finite-mass neutrino causes a significant effect on the CMB spectrum. For the masses below $\sum m_\nu \lesssim 1.5$ eV, the neutrinos affect the CMB spectrum mainly through the effect on the angular diameter distance out to the last-scattering surface. In this case the effect is degenerate with other cosmological parameters such as the matter energy density parameter Ω_{m0} and the Hubble constant h [5]. Thus other cosmological probes complementary to CMB are needed to break the parameter degeneracies in order to explore the small mass scales of neutrinos.

The massive neutrinos affect the growth of the matter density perturbation mainly due to following two physical mechanisms [6]. First of all, a massive neutrino becomes nonrelativistic at $T \sim m_{\nu_i}$ and has contributed to the energy density of cold dark matter (CDM), which changes the matter-radiation equality epoch and has changed an expansion rate of the universe since that time. When we fix the total mass of neutrinos, only the latter effect is effective. Second, the matter density perturbations on small scales can be suppressed due to the neutrinos free-streaming. As long as neutrinos are relativistic, they travel at speed of light, and their free-streaming scales are approximately equal to the Hubble horizon. Then the free-streaming effect erases their own perturbations within such scales.

Neutrino masses from cosmology have been studied combining observations of CMB anisotropies with Galaxy Clustering [7–9], with Weak Lensing [10], with Lyman-α Forest [11, 12], and so on. The current WMAP 7-year (WMAP7) dataset constrains the sum of neutrino masses to be $\sum m_\nu < 1.3$ eV (95% C.L.) [13]. By combining the CMB (WMAP7) data with the distance measurements from the baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) and the Hubble constant (H_0) measurement, the robust upper bound has been reported to be $\sum m_\nu < 0.58$ eV (95% C.L.), for a flat ΛCDM model plus one additional parameter of the total neutrino mass [13].

The CMB B-mode polarization produced by a CMB lensing gives us more detailed information on the matter power spectrum at later epochs, which means it has better sensitivities for smaller neutrino masses down to $\lesssim 0.1$ eV. That is essential to distinguish the normal hierarchy from the inverted one.

In this *Letter*, as the most effective means of introducing the effect of the massive neutrinos in cosmology, we adopt Planck [14] for ongoing CMB observations, including B-mode polarization produced by a CMB lensing, and we adopt the BigBOSS experiment [15], for future observations of BAO and the growth of structure with an allsky galaxy redshift survey. By comparing these combined observational data with flat ΛCDM model plus two additional parameter of the total neutrino mass $\sum m_\nu$ and the effective number of neutrino species N_ν, we estimate errors of the bounds on the total neutrino mass to be $\Delta\sum m_\nu \sim 0.03$ eV. In case that the fiducial values of the total neutrino mass is taken to be $\sum m_\nu = 0.05$ eV, this means that the neutrino mass hierarchy must be normal.

---

* k_hirano@tsuru.ac.jp

[1] B. Aharmim *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 111301 (2008).
[2] P. Adamson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 131802 (2008).
[3] T. Thümmler, Phys. Part. Nucl. **42**, 590 (2011).
[4] J. J. Gómez-Cadenas, J. Martín-Albo, M. Sorel, P. Ferrario, F. Monrabal, J. Muñoz, P. Novella, and A. Poves, JCAP **1106**, 007 (2011).
[5] K. Ichikawa, M. Fukugita, and M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 043001 (2005).
[6] J. Lesgourgues and S. Pastor, Phys. Rept. **429**, 307 (2006).
[7] S. Saito, M. Takada, and A. Taruya, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 191301 (2008).
[8] S. Saito, M. Takada, and A. Taruya, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 083528 (2009).
[9] S. Saito, M. Takada, and A. Taruya, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 043529 (2011).
[10] K. Ichiki, M. Takada, and T. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 023520 (2009).
[11] M. Viel and M. G. Haehnelt, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **365**, 231 (2006).
[12] U. Seljak, A. Slosar, and P. McDonald, JCAP **0610**, 014 (2006).
[13] E. Komatsu *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **192**, 18 (2011).
[14] J. Lesgourgues, L. Perotto, S. Pastor, and M. Piat, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 045021 (2006).
[15] D. Schlegel *et al.*, arXiv:1106.1706 [astro-ph.IM] .